

RESOLUTION re ECONOMIC AND INDUSTRIAL SURVEY.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (Pattanamtitta): Sir, I beg to move the following resolution:—

"This Council recommends to the Government—

PRESIDENT: Speak up, please.

• MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (Pattanamtitta):

"This Council recommends to Government that a committee, with a non-official majority, be appointed to conduct an early economic and industrial survey of the State and to formulate proposals conducive to the material regeneration of the country."

സർ, എല്ലാ പരിഷ്കൃതരാജ്യങ്ങളിലും അവയുടെ ഉണ്ടാകുന്ന വിഭവങ്ങളെ അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തി തദ്ദേശസ്വയത്തു നിർണ്ണയിക്കപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലാകട്ടെ ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു ശ്രമം ഇതുവരെയും ഉണ്ടായിട്ടില്ല. തന്നിമിത്തം തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ജനങ്ങളുടെ സാമ്പത്തികനില എന്താണെന്ന് അറിവാൻ പാടില്ല. ജനങ്ങളുടെ സാമ്പത്തികോല്പാദനത്തിന് നാട്ടിലെ ഭൗതിക സമ്പത്തിന്റെ അളവും വ്യാപ്തിയും, വ്യവസായാഭിവൃദ്ധിക്കു ജനസൈന്യകൃത്യവും പ്രേരണാശക്തികളും എത്രത്തോളം ഉണ്ടെന്ന് അറിയാതെ നിർവാഹമില്ല. മറ്റു രാജ്യങ്ങളിൽ അഭിവൃദ്ധിപരമായ എല്ലാ പദ്ധതികളും ഇപ്രകാരമുള്ള പശ്ചേക്ഷണത്തിന്റെ ഫലമായിട്ടാണ് രൂപകരിക്കപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നത്. പരിസ്ഥിതികളെ പരിശോധിച്ചുനോക്കുമ്പോൾ തിരുവിതാംകൂർ ഇന്ന് ലോകത്തുള്ള എല്ലാ രാജ്യങ്ങളേയുമ്പേക്കിച്ച് സാമ്പത്തികനിലയിലും, അതിനെ ആശ്രയിച്ചുനിൽക്കുന്ന മറ്റൊല്ലാ ജീവിതശാഖകളിലും, പിന്നോക്കമാണെന്ന് പ്രത്യക്ഷപ്പെടുന്നതാണ്. ധനസ്ഥിതിയിലാകട്ടെ, രാഷ്ട്രീയശക്തിയിലാകട്ടെ, വ്യവസായ പോഷണത്തിലാകട്ടെ കാർഷികോന്നമനത്തിലാകട്ടെ, സാങ്കേതിക വിദ്യാഭ്യാസത്തിലാകട്ടെ ജീവിതമാറ്റങ്ങളിലാകട്ടെ, തിരുവിതാംകൂർ, മറ്റൊരു രാജ്യത്തോടും കിടപിടിക്കുന്നില്ലെന്നുള്ളത് വ്യക്തപ്പെടുത്താം.

കർഷകന്മാരുടെ നില ഇൻഡ്യയിലെ മറ്റുഭാഗങ്ങളിലെന്നപോലെ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലും കർഷകവൃത്തിയെയാണല്ലോ ജനങ്ങൾ പ്രധാനമായി ആശ്രയിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത്. ൧൦൦-നു നൂറ് വീതം ജനങ്ങൾ കൃഷിയെ ആശ്രയിച്ചു ജീവിക്കുന്നു. ഇതിൽ എത്രപേരാണ് യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ കർഷകവൃത്തി അനുഷ്ഠിച്ചുവരുന്നതെന്ന് അറിയുവാൻ നിർവാഹമില്ല. തൊഴിൽ പോലിക്കമ്പോൾ കൃഷി എന്ന പരയുക ഇവിടെ സാധാരണയാണ്. ഏതായാലും രാജ്യത്തുള്ള ജനങ്ങളിൽ നൂറ് ശതമാനത്തിൽ

[Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai.]

ന്റെ ജീവിതസംരക്ഷണ ഭൂമിയെ അവലംബിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു. ഇവിടത്തെ കൃഷിക്കാർ ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് ഇൻഡ്യയിലെ ജനങ്ങളെ അപേക്ഷിച്ച് പിന്നോക്കമാണെന്നു ഗവർണ്മെൻറിന്റെ പ്രസിദ്ധീകരണത്തന്നെ നാഷ്ണലിസത്തിനുണ്ട്. Travancore State Manual ൩-ാം വാല്യം ൧൧൪-ാം വശത്തു് ഇപ്രകാരം പ്രസ്താവിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു:—

“തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ കൃഷിക്കാർ ഇൻഡ്യയിൽ മറ്റുസ്ഥലങ്ങളിലെ തന്റെ സഹോദരന്മാരെപ്പോലെ ബുദ്ധിമാനം, പരിശ്രമിയും, രാജഭക്തരും, നിയമാനുസാരിയും ആണ്. അയാളുടെ ജീവിതം വളരെ കഷ്ടമാണ്. വലിച്ചുവരുന്ന കുടുംബശ്ലേഷങ്ങളും അവസാനമില്ലാത്ത ദുരിതവും, അതോടുകൂടി ധനവും, സമയവും, വ്യയം ചെയ്യേണ്ടിവരുന്ന കുടുംബ സംബന്ധമായും, സാമൂഹികമായുമുള്ള ചുമതലകളും അയാൾക്ക് ദുർഭരമായിത്തീർന്നിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഇതുകൂടാതെ ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് ഇൻഡ്യയിലെ സഹോദരന്മാർക്കു സമ്പാദ്യത്തിലും, നിർവഹണശക്തിയിലും, ആഹാരത്തിലും, കുറഞ്ഞു്, ഒരു ക്ഷീണിച്ച പ്രജയായിട്ടു കാണപ്പെടുന്നു. ചോറിലെ വെള്ളമാണ് അയാളുടെ പ്രധാന ആഹാരം, ശേഷിച്ചതു് മരച്ചീനിയുമാണ്. വസ്ത്രധാരണം തീരെ മോശമാണ്.”

ഈ പ്രസിദ്ധീകരണത്തിന്റെ ൧൩൩-ാം വശത്തു് കൃഷിക്കാരിൽ ൧൦-നു നൂറു വീതം ആളുകൾ കടത്തിൽ പെട്ടിരിക്കയാണെന്നും പ്രസ്താവിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്ക് തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ ധനസ്ഥിതി ഏറ്റവും പരിതാപകരമായ നിലയിലാണെന്നു പ്രത്യക്ഷമാകുന്നുണ്ടല്ലോ.

ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് ഇൻഡ്യയിൽ, പഞ്ചാബിൽ ഒരാളിനു ആണ്ടൊന്നു ശരാശരി ൫൪ രൂപയും, മദ്ധ്യസംസ്ഥാനത്തു് ൫൦ രൂപയും; ബെങ്കാളിൽ ൪൦ രൂപയും മദ്രാസിൽ ൩൯-൦ ബാംബയിൽ ൩൦-൦ ബിഹാർ റിസായിൽ ൩൯-൦ ഇങ്ങിനെ ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് ഇൻഡ്യയ്ക്കു് ശരാശരി ൪൬ രൂപയും വീതം വരവുണ്ടെന്നു കാണുന്നു. ഈ നിലക്ക് തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ഇതിലും കുറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുമെന്നുള്ളതു് അവിതർക്കിതമാണല്ലോ. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ൧൫-നുമേൽ ൨൦ രൂപയ്ക്കും വരവുണ്ടാകുമെന്നാണ് ഉദ്ദേശിക്കപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നതു്. എത്രയാണെന്നു ക്ലിപ്തപ്പെടുത്തേണ്ടതു ഗവർണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ചുമതലയുമാണല്ലോ.

നെൽകൃഷി—തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ഇപ്പോൾ ൩൩,൮൯,൩൮൯ ഏക്കർ സ്ഥലത്തു് നെൽകൃഷി ചെയ്തു വരുന്നുണ്ടു്. ആരോഗ്യപരമായ ജീവിതത്തിനു് ദിവസേന ഒരാളിനു് ഒന്നുകാൽപ്പത്തൽ അരിവീതം ആവശ്യമുണ്ടെന്നു കണക്കാക്കപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നു. ഈ തോതനുസരിച്ചു് ഇവിടെ

രൊണ്ടത്തേക്ക് ഒരു കോടിപ്പാക്ക് അരി ആവശ്യമുണ്ടെന്നു കാണുന്നു. ൨൦ ലക്ഷത്തോളം പാക്ക് അരി വിദേശങ്ങളിൽനിന്നും ഇറക്കുമതി ചെയ്യപ്പെടുന്നതുകൊണ്ടും മറച്ചിനിതൃഷ്ടികൊണ്ടും മാത്രമാണ് ഈ നാട്ടു കാർ ജീവസന്ധാരണം ചെയ്യുന്നത്. ഫലഭൂയിഷ്ടമായ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ നിലങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും നമ്മുടെ ആവശ്യത്തിനു തക്കവണ്ണം വിളവുണ്ടാകാത്തതിനുള്ള കാരണം പ്രത്യേകം അറിയേണ്ടതാണ്.

തെങ്ങുകൃഷിയിലൂടെ ൫ ലക്ഷത്തിൽപരം ഏക്കർസ്ഥലത്തു ഇപ്പോൾ തെങ്ങുകൃഷി ചെയ്തുവരുന്നുണ്ട്. ഇതിൽ മൂന്നിൽ ഒരുഭാഗം കാഫലം തുടങ്ങാത്തതും വയസ്സുപെട്ട പലം തീരെ നശിച്ചതും നീക്കിയാൽ ൩൫ ലക്ഷം ഏക്കർ സ്ഥലത്തു മാത്രമേ തെങ്ങു ഇപ്പോൾ ഫലപ്രദമായി കാണുകയുള്ളൂ. ൧൦ ന്ൻ മാണ്ടത്തെ കയറുമതികണക്കിൽ നിന്നും കൊപ്രായായും, വെളിച്ചെണ്ണയായും, നാളികേരമായും കയറുമതി ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളത് ൮൪ കോടിയിൽ ചിലപാനം നാളികേരം വരുന്നു. ഇതിൽ മൂന്നിൽ ഒരു ഭാഗം ഈ രാജ്യത്തിലെ ചിലവിനായി ഉപയോഗിച്ചുവരുന്നതായി വിചാരിക്കുന്നപക്ഷം ആകെയുള്ള നാളികേര ഉല്പത്തി രൊണ്ടിൽ ൧൧൨ കോടിയാണെന്നു സമത്വിക്കാം. ഒരേക്കർസ്ഥലത്തു ശരാശരി ൫൦ നാളികേരവൃക്ഷം കണക്കാക്കിയാൽ ഈ ക്രമത്തിനു ഒരു തെങ്ങിൽനിന്നും രൊണ്ടിൽ ശരാശരി ൪൫ നാളികേരംവീതമാണു കിട്ടുന്നത്. ഇതത്രയോ തുച്ഛമായ ഒരുദായമായിരിക്കുന്നു. പലസ്ഥലങ്ങളിലും തെങ്ങുകൾക്കു രോഗം ബാധിച്ച് അനുഭവം നാശിക്കുവാൻ കറഞ്ഞു വരികയാണു ചെയ്യുന്നതു. ഇതിനുള്ള കാരണം എന്താണെന്നും ആരാഞ്ഞറിയേണ്ടകാലം അതിക്രമിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.

ഭൂമി പറ്റിയിരിക്കുന്ന മറ്റൊരുപക്ഷം കാര്യക്ഷമമായ കർഷകവൃത്തിക്കു പര്യാപ്തമാകാത്തനിലയിൽ കൃഷിസ്ഥലങ്ങളുടെ വിസ്തീർണ്ണം കുറഞ്ഞുവരുന്നതാണ്. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ജനസംഖ്യയുടെ ക്രമത്തിനു ആളൊന്നിനു് ഒരേക്കറിൽ കുറഞ്ഞ ഭൂമിയുടെ വിസ്തീർണ്ണം കാണുന്നോളം കൂട്ടുകടംബജീവിതത്തിന്റെ ശവസംസ്കാരം കഴിഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്ന തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഭൂമി ഉപയോഗമില്ലാത്തവിധത്തിൽ മരിന്നഭിന്നമായി പോകുന്നതിനു കാലതാമസം ഒട്ടുതന്നെയില്ല.

അതുകൊണ്ട് ജീവിതരീതിയെ പരിരക്ഷിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള ഒരു പദ്ധതി ധനസംബന്ധമായ ഒരു സർവ്വേ മൂലമല്ലാതെ ലഭിക്കാൻ തരമില്ല.

വ്യവസായം—തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ൧൦൦-നു ൧൫ വീതം ജനങ്ങൾ മാത്രമേ വ്യവസായത്തിൽ ഏർപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ളൂ. ഇന്നത്തെ കയറുമതി കണക്കനുസരിച്ചാൽ നമ്മുടെ സാമാനങ്ങൾ എല്ലാം അസംസ്കൃതനിലയിൽ

[Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai.]

ലാൺ അന്യരാജ്യങ്ങളിലേക്ക് കയറുമതിചെയ്യപ്പെടുന്നത്. ഈ സാമാനങ്ങൾ യൂറോപ്യൻ വ്യവസായശാലകളിൽ പ്രവേശിച്ച് വേഷപ്പകച്ചുയോടുകൂടി നമ്മുടെമുമ്പിൽ അവതരിക്കപ്പെടുമ്പോൾ നമുക്കു ലഭിച്ചുവിലയിൽനിന്നും പത്തു മടങ്ങു വിലകൊടുത്തു നാംതന്നെ വാങ്ങിക്കുന്നു. ഇവിടെയുണ്ടാകുന്ന സാധനങ്ങൾ അന്യനാടുകളിൽ ഏതെല്ലാംതരത്തിൽ രൂപാന്തരപ്പെടുത്തപ്പെടുന്നു എന്നും, അവയുടെ ഉപയോഗങ്ങൾ എന്തെല്ലാമാണെന്നും, അറിയുന്നതിനായി ഒരു ശ്രമവും ചെയ്യുവേണ്ടിയില്ല. നമ്മുടെ വ്യവസായപ്രവർത്തനത്തിൽ മറ്റൊരു പ്രധാനസ്ഥാനത്തിൽ വിതരണശൃംഖലയുടെ സ്ഥിതിക്ക് വലിയ തോതിലുള്ള (Factory Industry) പണ്ടകശാല വ്യവസായത്തിന് എത്രത്തോളം സെങ്കിയും നൽകുന്നു എന്ന് പഠിക്കുന്നതാകുന്നു. തുടങ്ങുന്ന പദ്ധതികളുടെ സാധ്യമാഗ്ഗവും, പ്രായോഗികഫലവും, മനസ്സിലാക്കാതെ വെച്ചു പ്രസ്ഥാനങ്ങളിൽ ധനവായം ചെയ്യുന്നത് ഒരു വലിയ അപനയമാണ്. പണ്ടകശാല വ്യവസായമോ (factory industry) ഗ്രാമവ്യവസായമോ (cottage industry) ഏതാണ് നമുക്കു പറ്റിയതെന്നും, ഏതെല്ലാം വ്യവസായങ്ങൾ ലാഭകരമായിത്തീർത്താമെന്നും, അതിലേക്ക് ഏതെല്ലാം ഉപകരണങ്ങൾ ആവശ്യമുണ്ടെന്നും പരിശോധിക്കേണ്ടതായിരിക്കുന്നു. ഇവിടെ ഇതിലേക്ക് ഇടക്കാലങ്ങളിൽ ചില ശ്രമങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടായത് പ്രയോജനത്തിൽ വന്നിട്ടില്ല. ധനപരിപോഷണക്കമ്മറ്റി ഏർപ്പെടുത്തിയതുകൊണ്ടോ, കുറെ യുവാക്കളെ വിദേശങ്ങളിലയച്ച് ഓരോശാഖയിലും വൈദഗ്ദ്ധ്യം നേടിച്ചതുകൊണ്ടോ നമുക്കു വ്യവസായവർദ്ധനയുണ്ടാകുന്നതല്ല. ഇപ്പോൾതന്നെ പല ഗ്രാമവ്യവസായങ്ങളും ഇവിടെ നടപ്പിലുണ്ട്. എന്നാൽ അവയെ പുഷ്ടിപ്പെടുത്തേണ്ട മാർഗ്ഗങ്ങൾക്കു യാതൊരു പദ്ധതിയും ഇല്ല. ഈ നിലയിൽ തുടർപോകുവാൻ നാട്ടിൽ വർദ്ധിച്ചുവരുന്ന തൊഴിലില്ലായ്മയും, തന്നിമിത്തമുള്ള നിലംനാശവും ഒരിക്കലും അനുവദിക്കുന്നതല്ല. സാഹിത്യപരമായ വിദ്യാഭ്യാസവുംകൊണ്ട് ആണ്ടുതോറും അനേകായിരം യുവജനങ്ങൾ ജീവിതരംഗത്തിൽ പ്രവേശിക്കുന്നു. ഇവരിൽ വിദ്യാഭ്യാസം പൂർത്തിയാക്കാതെ തോറും മടങ്ങുന്നവരും, പൂർത്തിയായവരിൽതന്നെ അവരുടെ ഏകാവാശ്ശുമായ സർക്കാരുദ്യോഗം ലഭിക്കാതെ അലഞ്ഞുനടക്കുന്നവരും ഉൾപ്പെടുന്നു. ഇതിനുംപുറമേ ദേശപ്രയത്നംകൊണ്ടുമാത്രം കാലയാപനം ചെയ്യേണ്ടവരായി വലുതായ ഒരു ജനവിഭാഗവും ഉണ്ട്. അവരുടെ ദേശശക്തിയെ നാട്ടിൽ പ്രയോജനപ്പെടുത്തി അവർക്കു രാജ്യത്തിനും ഒന്നുപോലെ അഭിവൃദ്ധിയുണ്ടേണ്ടതായിട്ടുണ്ട്.

ഈ കാര്യങ്ങൾക്ക് നാട്ടിന്റെ നാനാഭാഗങ്ങളിലും സഞ്ചരിച്ച് ജനങ്ങളുടെ ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ ധനസ്ഥിതിയും, കാലയാപന മാറ്റങ്ങളുടെ നിലയും, അന്വേഷിച്ചറിഞ്ഞും ഓരോസ്ഥലത്തേക്കും അനുയോജ്യമായ വ്യവസ്ഥകൾ ഏർപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്നു സൂക്ഷ്മമായി പഠിച്ചും, അവയുടെ പ്രവർത്തനത്തിന് ആവശ്യമുള്ള ഉപകരണങ്ങൾ ഏർപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്ന് പ്രത്യേകിച്ചു മനസ്സിലാക്കിയും ഒരു പദ്ധതി നിർമ്മിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് മാത്രമേ നമ്മുടെ നാമ്പത്തിക-നിർമ്മാണ വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ സാധിക്കുകയുള്ളൂ.

ഇതിലേക്കു ഒരു കമ്മീഷൻമുഖേന അന്വേഷണം നടത്തുകയാണ് പ്രായോഗികമായ മാർഗ്ഗം.

ആയതുകൊണ്ട് ധനസംബന്ധമായും വ്യവസായപരമായുള്ള ഒരു സർവ്വേ നടത്തുന്നതിന് നിർദ്ദേശിക്കപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ സഭയുടെ അംഗീകരണത്തിനായി സമർപ്പിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I second the resolution.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): I do not believe any real good can be done by the appointment of such a committee. Various committees with identical objects in view have been brought into existence in British India, in England and America. I do not know whether by a few people putting their heads together and wasting their time, anything particular can be evolved out of their deliberations.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): May I know which is the committee that has been appointed with an identical purpose.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): I had in view the Economic Development Board, the Industrial Commission and other committees. This committee, I suppose, is meant for the sake of improving the economic condition of the country, for reconstruction and other purposes. Of course, anything that is calculated to help us in promoting the industrial prosperity of the country, whether agricultural, industrial or commercial, may be included. I do not think that it would be wise for the Government to let the matter alone. My humble suggestion is that the heads of the various Development Departments should be asked to find out what is being done in this matter by countries like America, Australia and also British India, and to go round and formulate schemes. It would then be time for the representatives of the Council and Government to criticise and try to evolve some scheme. There are several ways in which this can be done; but I think there is no use of wasting our time. We have got the best experts here like the Directors of Agriculture and Industries who have been devoting a good deal of thought and attention to these matters. If they could be asked to collect all the information relevant to the subject and

[Mr. K. C. Mammen Mappillai.]

then if they could be asked to elaborate a draft scheme and then submit it for general discussion and for criticism by this House or to a committee elected by this House, I think that would be much more practical.

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): May I know whether the member proposes a committee consisting purely of officials and their opinion obtained, and after that does the member propose that a committee consisting of non-officials should be formed?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): The member may take it in whatever way he likes. I have expressed my opinion.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Sir, I have listened to the speech, in which Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai has recommended his resolution, with very deep interest and with very mixed feelings. Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai has asked for the appointment of a committee, with a *non-official* majority, to conduct an early economic and industrial survey of the State, and to "formulate proposals conducive to the material regeneration of the country". I wish to submit, at the outset, Sir, that he has brought together two different proposals, for each of which different types of workers might be necessary. For the purpose of formulating proposals for the material regeneration of the country, I think it is conceivable that a committee consisting of hard-headed practical men, who would prevent experts running away with Government money for the furtherance of their pet schemes, might be of very great value. If a committee consisting entirely of experts is appointed, each expert is likely to foresee the prosperity of the country only if his pet ideas are carried out. In a case like that, I can conceive of the utility of having a number of shrewd business-men associated with experts, in an enquiry which would formulate proposals for the material regeneration of the country. But if the object of Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai is only to have a committee at work for this purpose, may I ask what necessity there is for a *fresh* committee, when admittedly, a committee of this nature *has* been in office and is to continue for some time to come? I take it that the purpose for which the Economic Development Board exists, under the distinguished guidance of my friend Dr. Kunjan Pillai, and in his absence of Mr. Dhanukoti Pillai—

MR. K. K. THOMAS (*Kottayam*): May I know if the Economic Development Board has ever attempted to formulate any schemes to ascertain the wealth of the country?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Sir, I am, at the present moment, restricting myself to the *second* half of Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai's proposition. Mr. K. K. Thomas asks me to discuss the *first* half of the resolution which I will discuss later on. Sir, I may be allowed to develop the argument in my own manner, and not to be assisted in confusing the issue (*laughter*).

Well, Sir, I take it that it will be a courageous question to ask after the amount of publicity we have had in regard to the transactions of the Economic Development Board, whether it has made any proposals, which in its opinion are likely to be conducive to the material regeneration of the country. We might have any amount of difference of opinion in regard to the merits of particular proposals made by the Economic Development Board but none on the fact that the Board exists for this very purpose. No committee, that might be constituted hereafter to do the same work, is likely to receive much more public appreciation and much more public support than the Economic Development Board has received.

I have found again, Sir, a certain amount of difficulty in understanding the point of Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai's recommendation that the committee of enquiry, which he is suggesting, should have a *non-official* majority. I could not presume that so sober a member, as Mr. Narayana Pillai, was only carried away by the fashionable desire to have a non-official majority for every committee. It has of course struck me that, on certain topics of enquiry, where the results of the investigation might be utilised by the Government to try and add to the pressure of taxation, it might be of some possible advantage to have a few non-official people added to the committees undertaking such enquiries, in order that they might watch the action of the Government side. Again, Sir, for the purpose of formulating proposals for the material regeneration of the country a committee with a non-official majority might in some cases be useful. But, it is really not a question of non-official or official which is really going to matter in such a case. It is really a question of only having shrewd men on the committee who know what they are about. You might constitute a non-official committee which would stultify itself in 24 hours. You could effect the same thing with an official committee. The question is not therefore one of the proportion of officials and non-officials on such a committee. It is really a question as to the manner in which we might constitute a committee by putting in it men who would be competent to make recommendations, which will command the respect of the country.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): Can it not be that the member had more faith in a non-official majority when he recommended it?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): He might have, Sir. But I am trying to deal not with questions of *faith*, but with the matters which the member would like to *argue* out here. I do not think that Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai was asking us to confide in his *faith* in non-officials. I thought he was appealing to our reason, and not asking us to accept his dogmas simply because he accepts them.

Now, Sir, in regard to the Economic Development Board, it is well known that it has already a non-official majority. If the object of Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai is therefore to create a body, with a non-official majority, to formulate proposals for the material regeneration of

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

the country, I would answer that such a body is already in existence, and that I have not heard in this Council or elsewhere any pronounced dissatisfaction with the work of this Board, or any wish to have it replaced.

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI (*Kottarakara cum Kunnattur*): May I know from Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar whether it is within the scope of the Economic Development Board to take statistics of agricultural, industrial, commercial and other matters?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I am not aware that the Board is precluded from justifying its recommendations by such previous enquiries as it thinks necessary for the purpose. It is very necessary for any Board, before it formulates its proposals, that it should be sure of its facts. Were I a member of the Board, I would first ask for facts, before I formulate recommendations for the acceptance of other people. However, Sir, all that is beside the issue. I merely want to make it clear that, if Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai's object is to create a committee for the purpose he has specified, such a committee already exists, and that it might be used for one of the two purposes for which this resolution is now moved.

I come now to the first half of the resolution, which recommends to the Government the appointment of a committee for making an early economic and industrial survey of the State. I heard it suggested just now, by way of an interpellation from one of the speakers, that such an enquiry has been committed by the Government of India to a body with an entire non-official constitution. There seems to be current a kind of hazy opinion, Sir, that the Government of India had accepted the principle of the appointment of such a committee, when it appointed the Economic Enquiry Committee, whose report was stated, in the papers received yesterday, as having been recently signed at Simla, I mean the committee over which Sir M. Visvesvarayya presided. To show how far this assumption is correct, I should like to read to the House the terms of reference to this committee. The following are the terms of reference:—

"To examine the material at present available for framing an estimate of the economic condition of the various classes of the people of British India; to report on its adequacy; and to make recommendations as to the best manner in which it may be supplemented, and as to the lines on which a general economic survey could be carried out, with an estimate of the expenditure involved in giving effect to such recommendations."

From the terms of reference to Sir M. Visvesvarayya's Committee, to which allusion has been made to-day, it will be clear that this body has not been appointed to conduct an economic survey of India, but merely to examine the materials now available for conducting such an economic survey, and to advise the Government on the method of conducting the survey, as also to state what further material might have to be gathered before such a survey might be profitably undertaken. If I

might be permitted to paraphrase the terms of reference to this Committee, I would say that the Committee has been appointed, *not* to conduct an economic survey but to suggest the *means* by which the survey could be conducted, and to examine the statistical information which the Government of India has been at pains to collect, through its numerous departments for a *considerable* number of years, and say how far that information will be useful for undertaking a general economic survey. This is a thing which is far different from what has been suggested for Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai's Committee. And, what is the type of non-official that we have in the India Committee? Sir M. Visvesvarayya, who presumably counts for a non-official now, was a British official throughout the greater part of his life, till he retired. After retirement, and subsequent to his pension in the British Service, he has been serving in an official capacity in more than one Indian State. Another member is a minister, and a third is a professor in one of the Universities who was previously in Government service. I press this point, Sir, to show that even for the purpose of conducting an enquiry into the *adequacy* of the materials for and advising on the proper method of undertaking an economic survey, the Government of India appointed a *small* committee, in which *every* member was a well-known *expert*. This is one of the points to which I would like to invite the House's attention.

As I said a little while ago, it is not a question of official or non-official, in forming a committee of this kind; it is only a question of getting competent men to undertake the enquiry. May I, in this connection, point out that the illustrations given by Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai, in the course of his eloquent speech, show that the enquiry is likely to be exceedingly difficult, particularly in our State, where the statistical information is not as abundant as we should like it to be? Though there is now much more information than there was before, still the information available is far too little. May I also say that an economic survey is one of the matters to which no Government is blind? As early as 1905, the question of undertaking such an enquiry in Travancore was considered by the Government. In 1907, the Government issued an order in which they sanctioned the undertaking of an *industrial* survey, of the Southern Division, by two officers. One of them was the Superintendent of the Agricultural Demonstration Farm at Karamanai and the other was myself. But, the Government, at the same time, asked this committee to complete the work in *three* months, in addition to the ordinary duties of the two officers! As the ordinary duties of the two officers were sufficiently heavy, and the officers were not consulted in the matter before they were appointed and the time-limit was fixed, they represented that they should be relieved of the work. From what I have been able to gather from the file, I note that, when Sir P. Rajagopalachari took charge as the Head of the Administration here, he seems to have been amused at this arrangement and ordered the proceedings to be recorded. It was then suggested to him that we should get an expert; and he asked, "How do you propose to get the expert?" One or two very highly-paid experts in other

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

places were suggested, but subsequently the whole file was recorded as apparently this suggestion was not approved. The question arose again in connection with the industrial survey, of which Dr. Barker was put in charge. Between 1092 and 1094, Dr. Barker conducted an industrial survey. His report has been printed and is available to the members of this House. Several members may have seen it. I see from the file that it has received very handsome testimonials from various experts. Still later, again, when the question of a re-settlement was considered, the Government came to the conclusion that, before any such thing could be undertaken, a preliminary economic survey, like that conducted in British India before re-settlement operations are commenced, should be undertaken. As far therefore as the Government are concerned, it cannot be said that they have not been alive to the importance of economic enquiries such as the pressure and the incidence of taxation, the cost of living and the manner in which various classes of people have been affected by the variations in prices. These are all matters in which all Governments have much concern. I am perfectly certain that our Government, which took up the question so early, and which has consistently been making enquiries of the kind, is not less alive to the value of a general economic survey than the non-official members on the other side of the House.

But, Sir, the question before the House is not whether an economic survey should be undertaken, but whether this resolution is to be accepted. The resolution insists that an economic survey, of a complex character, should be conducted by a body of persons, who would presumably be *not* in a position to do it properly. This, Sir, I submit, is a very large order on the House. An economic survey is a very difficult piece of work. The terms of reference to the Economic Enquiry Committee in British India show that the Government only wanted estimates and suggestions for the economic survey. May I submit in this connection that for a very small survey undertaken by Dr. Harold Mann in the Bombay Presidency, he required the assistance of a considerable staff though he took only three or four villages on the outskirts of Poona, where he was Principal of the Agricultural College? As the result of his survey, he has produced two volumes and they are printed and sold by the Oxford University Press. It is usual to submit dissertations recording economic surveys of small areas for the purpose of qualifying for Doctorates in British Universities. A general economic survey of a whole State is a very large thing altogether. Are we to ask a survey of this character to be undertaken by a body of the kind proposed by a member, so that we might have an accurate survey? We cannot have an *ekadesam* or an *uddesam*, or *oruvidham* estimates in an economic survey. Any figures collected must be such as cannot be challenged. It is, I repeat, a very difficult enquiry, well worth undertaking, and probably likely to be undertaken some time or other. But it can never be undertaken by a mixed committee, or by any committee what ever. It can be undertaken by a number of persons working together if each of the persons undertaking it are competent to do the work.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): May I know from Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar if Government are convinced of the necessity for an economic survey, and how they propose to conduct it irrespective of the committee?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): These questions do not arise.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): I want just to know from Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar, who has apparently spoken on behalf of Government, with regard to this particular resolution, and has recognised the necessity for an economic survey, what Government propose to do or whether they do propose to start any enquiry whatever in regard to this particular matter, irrespective of the appointment of a committee; whether it is only the appointment of a committee which is objected to by Government, or whether Government have anything to say with reference to the spirit of the resolution contained therein?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I have stated all that I can say here, in my remarks on the two points of the resolution. I have argued, firstly, that the resolution in its present form cannot be accepted, and, secondly, that, with regard to re-settlement operations, the Government have declared their desire to have an economic enquiry before the re-settlement.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): May I know from Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar whether an industrial survey is equally difficult or costly?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): A general economic survey is obviously more difficult and costly than an industrial survey which is only a part of it. An industrial survey in a country like Travancore—if I might give, not the opinion of Government, but my own personal opinion—is a far easier thing than an economic survey.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know from the member whether it is advisable to institute settlement proceedings before the economic survey, as the member assures the House, is undertaken?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I do not hear the member.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): I wish to ask the member whether it is advisable to institute settlement proceedings before an economic survey is undertaken by Government.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I am not prepared to offer any opinion, Sir, except on questions which are under discussion in the House.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Do the Government propose to do that?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I have already answered that question twice.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): Sir, from what I have been able to gather from the speech of Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai, I am inclined to think that his main attempt is to draw the attention of Government to the urgent necessity for conducting an economic survey so that Government may have an accurate, a fairly accurate, estimate of the wealth of the country, of the income per head of the population, of the incidence of taxation and similar matters such as how the variation in prices has affected the cost of living with a view to see that at a future settlement the incidence of taxation may be perfectly fair and reasonable.

In regard to the industrial survey, his object was, I should think, to impress upon Government that nothing practical had hitherto been effected in that direction and that there is ample scope for a proper survey with a view to better the material welfare of the people.

In regard to these two principles, I should think that even Government can have no objection in accepting them. The only difference of opinion appears to be, from what I have been able to gather from Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar's speech, about the *modus operandi*, how the enquiry should be conducted. As for the appointment of a committee with a non-official majority, I myself have no very great faith in committees of that sort, unless it be that we have got one or two really competent men who know their business in regard to this particular matter, who may be termed specialists in regard to matters relating to the industrial as well as the economic condition of the people.

In regard to economic survey, Sir, it is a very difficult matter indeed; and if I may say so, Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar, under whom I have had the privilege of learning economics, once directed us while we were students, to engage ourselves during the holidays in making out an economic survey of typical villages, and we ventured out and we found, as a matter of fact, it was really a very difficult task indeed. The nature of the work even now appeals me and I do not think that a committee with a non-official majority will be of very great use in that direction, unless we have got the help of local officers and also men of local experience to visit typical villages, collect statistics in regard to village life, then collect the materials and then generalise.

In regard to industrial survey again, I do not think that a non-official committee or a committee with a non-official majority will be of very great use here. The Economic Development Board is really a representative body inasmuch as the Legislative Council itself had the opportunity of electing four members to that particular Board. I see that this Council chose from amongst themselves only two members, and two outsiders who are very competent business men were also put in. Then three others were nominated by Government. Thus, we have got a Board of seven members, practically a standing board, as it were, upon which we spend something like eight to ten thousand rupees.

They should see that sub-committees are appointed in local areas to devise the necessary schemes and place them for the attention of Government. Of course it requires specialists or experts. Even in regard

to these matters, I suppose there are experts in the several branches in Government service. I do not think there is much use in wasting money by appointing a committee especially for purposes of this nature which involve work of considerable magnitude and also of importance which cannot certainly be adequately attended to by the sort of the non-official members that we used to get or that are available to us for such purposes. We can very well gain by the experience of the committees appointed elsewhere. Therefore, we should think twice before we commit ourselves to any such scheme just at present. With these observations, I resume my seat.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (Kārunāgāḍḍi): It was with very deep pleasure that I was myself listening to the most entertaining and eloquent address from that side of the House and I was persuaded to ask certain questions; but I was unwilling to do so lest I should have to incur any responsibility in confusing the issues. I find that questions which were not exactly relevant to the issue were brought under discussion. The learned member on the other side of the House referred to Sir Harold Manj and the big volume that he published and to the fact that they were printed in no less a press than in the Oxford University Press. The learned member on the other side admitted that the mover of the resolution is a sober gentleman. I may enlighten the House that he is also a plain blunt man. All that he wanted was that there must be a material regeneration of the country. He knew that there was the Development Board. One could know the existence of the Board only by its activities. Apparently, the Development Board was not sufficiently active. They did not formulate any proposal, and if at all they made any, it was not for the material regeneration of the country. So what I suggest is that there must be somebody, either a committee or an individual to go into the whole question and suggest ways and means for the material regeneration of the country.

Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar divided the resolution into two compartments. I should think that it was not warranted. What the mover wanted was to point out that a non-official committee may be appointed to conduct an early economic and industrial survey of the State and to formulate proposals conducive to the material regeneration of the country. They were one and the same idea. He wanted the survey with a view to formulate proposals conducive to the material regeneration of the country. He aimed at the result of the material regeneration of the country and for that he said that a survey would be very necessary and indispensable. When he suggested there must be a non-official majority, I suspected that he was betraying that if a group of experts should go into the matter they could possibly be only non-officials because many officials are for Government. Therefore in other words he wanted a small committee of experts to conduct an economic and an industrial survey of the State, with a view to formulate proposals conducive to the material regeneration of the country. I must confess that I was really surprised to hear Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar expressing his doubt and diffidence in the non-official committee doing

[Mr. A. K. Pillai.]

this work. I must also express my gratification with my friend Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai that I had the privilege of studying under him economics and he was, on many occasions, exhorting us to conduct economic enquiries in the villages in our own miniature way and having done that and having listened to the exhortation, which he made with enthusiasm and genuine eloquence, I am really surprised why he should express this diffidence, which is at this moment, if it is not for the exigencies of his particular position now—

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I will explain, Sir.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): My friend Mr. Rāngaswami Aiyangar recognises that there must be an economic survey, whether it be by a committee of non-official majority or not. But the mover suspects that there could not be a proper economic survey conducted by a majority of officials because among them capable experts could not possibly be got. So he says there must be a non-official majority of capable experts to go into the whole matter to conduct a survey with the assistance of local officers to formulate proposals conducive to material regeneration of the country. With these words, I heartily support the resolution.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): May I know, Sir, what further time we have got?

PRESIDENT: The discussion may go on till quarter past five.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): Sir, I also support the spirit of the resolution moved by Mr. Narayana Pillai. The question is not so much as to the agency which should conduct this economic or industrial survey but the need for it. With regard to the agency, I beg to suggest that the committee should contain at least one person who is an expert in industrial and economic matters. But the question is whether it is necessary to conduct an economic and industrial survey of the State. In regard to that matter, I do not think there can be two opinions. At the time of the budget discussion, I wanted to stress the point, especially in view of the statement made by the Financial Secretary that Government would encourage only cottage industry and they did not know what cottage industry could be started in Travancore. I read the other day to the House the opinion of the Economic Development Board in regard to the facilities for starting cottage industries in this State. In their opinion the only cottage industry that can be started in the State was textile industry, viz., weaving, and I also pointed out that weaving was a well-known cottage industry for a very long time, long before the Development Board was established or the members constituting the Board were born. It was being largely carried on as a cottage industry. So, in order to find out what other industries, especially cottage industries, could be started in Travancore, it is absolutely necessary that we should have an industrial survey conducted by an expert of very wide knowledge on industrial matters.

Probably, as Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar pointed out, an economic survey is a large order. It is an industrial survey, whether it is large or small, that has to be undertaken; and even in regard to an economic survey, though the Government of India found it difficult, I do not think it is such a difficult matter in a small country like Travancore. If we mind getting it done, I think it is very easy in a country whose area is only 7,000 sq. miles with a population of 40 lakhs. I would, therefore, apart from the agency which should conduct an economic survey, strongly support my friend Mr. Narayana Pillai in his view that an economic and industrial survey of the State should be undertaken as early as possible.

MR. W. H. PITT (*Commissioner of Police*): I move that the question be now put.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Secretary to Government*): I second it.

The closure motion was put and carried.

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): ഈ പ്രമേയം ഹാജരാക്കുന്നതിന് എന്തെങ്കിലും സംഗതികളിൽ ഏറ്റവും പ്രധാനമായത് ഞാൻ ഒരു തിരുവിതാംകൂർക്കാരനായതുകൊണ്ടും എന്റെ നാട്ടിലുള്ള ജനങ്ങൾ ദാരിദ്ര്യംകൊണ്ടും തൊഴിൽ ഇല്ലായ്മകൊണ്ടും കഷ്ടത അനുഭവിച്ചുവരുന്നത് കണ്ടിട്ടാണ്. ഈ ദൈവദാസം സംഗതിയാണ് ഈ പ്രമേയം കൊണ്ടുവരാൻ എന്ന് പ്രേരിപ്പിച്ചത്. പക്ഷെ ഞാൻ ഈ നിലയിൽ അല്ലായിരുന്നെങ്കിൽ ഞാൻ ഇതിന് അനുകൂലിക്കാതെ തന്നെ വന്നേക്കാമായിരുന്നു. ഈ പ്രമേയത്തിലുള്ള മറ്റൊരു സംഗതി ഇതാണ്. അതായത് തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ധനസ്ഥിതിയേയും വ്യവസായസ്ഥിതിയേയും സംബന്ധിച്ച പത്ത്വേക്ഷണം ചെയ്യേണ്ടത് ആവശ്യമാണെന്ന് ഗവർണ്മെന്റുഭാഗത്തുനിന്നും അഭിപ്രായം വന്നിട്ടുണ്ട്. പക്ഷേ അത് സാധൂകരിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള മാറ്റം എത്രമാത്രം വിഷമമുള്ളതാണെന്ന് വേണ്ട ആലോചിക്കേണ്ടത്. ഏതുവിധത്തിലും തിരുവിതാംകൂറിന്റെ ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ അധസ്ഥയും തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ തൊഴിൽ ഇല്ലായ്മയും കാലക്ഷേപത്തിന് മാറ്റമില്ലാതെയും ഉള്ളവരുടെ സംഖ്യവർദ്ധിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ കാലത്ത് അതിന് പരിഹാരമായി ഒരു വ്യവസ്ഥാസംഗ്രഹം പത്ത്വേക്ഷണമില്ലാതെ സാധിക്കയില്ലെന്ന് ഗവർണ്മെന്റു അഭിപ്രായം പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഇപ്പോൾ നാണയനാശിപ്പാലം ജാർജിയും അനുസരിച്ച് ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റി സ്ഥാപിക്കണമെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം. ഡവപ്പെപ്പമെന്റു ബോഡിൽ ഒരു മെമ്പർ ആയിട്ടു എന്ന് ഉൾപ്പെടുത്താത്തതുകൊണ്ട് എനിക്ക് വിരോധമില്ല. അതിനാൽ യോഗ്യനായ ആളുകളിൽ ഭൂരിപക്ഷം അനുജോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ ചേർന്ന ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റി ഏല്പിക്കട്ടെ ഒരു സർവ്വേയെടുത്തു അത്യാ

[Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai.]

വശമാണ്. അതു വിശ്വേശ്വരൻ കൂടാമെന്നു നടത്തണം. അങ്ങനെയുള്ള വിശ്വേശ്വരൻ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിന് വെളിയിൽ ഉള്ളവരായിരുന്നാലും സ്വീകാര്യയോഗ്യമായിട്ടാണ് കരുതേണ്ടത്. അതിനാൽ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ വോട്ടിന് ഇടണമെന്ന് അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Sir, we have had the explanation of the mover of this resolution and also of Mr. A. K. Pillai that this resolution has got to be considered apart from the specific proposals it contains. I thought, Sir, when I dealt with the resolution, that I would be doing an injustice to the member if I did not attach the fullest weight to all the suggestions embodied in the resolution, as far as the value of an economic survey is concerned. It was for the purpose of drawing attention to that fact I said that I would always agree to the proposition that an economic survey is of very great value to any constituted Government. On that point, as I said, the Government do not mean to recede. There remain only two or three points of detail, which have been brought forward in the course of the discussion of this resolution; from the other side of the House, to which I feel compelled now to refer. To begin with, Mr. A. K. Pillai alluded, with some surprise, to my referring to the Oxford University Press having published Dr. Mann's treatise. My object in doing it was not to advertise the book on the ground that it had been published by a well-known firm of publishers also, but it was merely to show that the book was not a secret book but was available easily for sale to the public. I have had the idea that, in many of the suggestions for an economic survey, sufficient comprehension has not been shown of the difficulty of such a survey or of the manner in which it has to be conducted. My object in suggesting to the member this treatise, and in giving the name of the publisher from whom it could be obtained, was that something might be done thereby to diminish the volume of such uninformed suggestions in regard to the undertaking of an economic survey. I wished to make it clear that it is really a difficult work, a work which will be prolonged for months, or years and I wished to draw the attention of this House to this aspect, not less than that of the mover.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): May I assure the member that I accept the explanation with pleasure?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I am overwhelmed with gratification, Sir. (*Laughter*).

The second point that Mr. A. K. Pillai raised was that I was rather unfair in dividing the resolution of Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai into two halves. He said that they are one and indivisible and he also made out that an economic survey would be first wanted for the purpose of enabling the committee which has been proposed to formulate suggestions for the material regeneration of the country. On that point, Sir,

I thought I had made it clear that without proper data it would be very unwise for any person or body of persons to make recommendations and that, if people accept such recommendations when they are not supported by proper data, they would be equally unwise. Perhaps, the point that I had failed to make sufficiently clear was this. The type of knowledge, ability and experience or equipment generally that we require for a person conducting an economic survey is a very different thing from the type of ability, experience, or equipment generally that is required for formulating suggestions for the material regeneration of the country. An economic survey is a scientific undertaking. A high-and-dry, an austere economist might be a most successful surveyor; a politician, a person who is not a business man, or one who is not accustomed to the prosaic methods of evaluation, or one who is accustomed to allow his feelings to get the better of his judgment, he would be a nuisance in the conduct of an economic survey. On the other hand, a person of some imagination, of some judgment and of considerable experience of the place would be a person from whom we would like to have advice in regard to schemes of economic development. A professor of economics might be a successful surveyor. But, though I belong to the class of professors, I would ordinarily hesitate to accept the opinion of mere professors in regard to schemes for the material development of a country. That is the point I laboured, and that is the distinction I endeavoured to stress. To ask the same committee to undertake both these functions would be in effect to necessitate a committee composed of persons possessing two divergent types of ability, not ordinarily found together. The suggestion would practically result in the wrong type of men being got together for undertaking both kinds of work. It is only for this purpose, that I made the discrimination between the first half and the second half of the resolution.

I had also another object in doing so, which I will now explain. When Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai was asking for a new committee, when a committee, consisting of practical men, already existed, this Council had to be reminded that public money is already being expended in maintaining such a Board as Mr. Narayana Pillai now wants to create, and that there is no wisdom in multiplying Boards with similar constitutions and aims.

The third point, that I wish to bring forward here, is this. Mr. A. Krishna Pillai gave expression to a mild astonishment at my exhortation to pupils to conduct an economic survey and to my horror for a non-official committee being now constituted for the same purpose. May I say that I was making no distinction between non-officials and officials, but only the distinction between competent and incompetent persons? I wanted to show that emphasis should not be laid on the economic survey or industrial survey being done by a committee with a *non-official* majority. My point is that the economic survey can be conducted only by a body of *competent* persons, whether official or non-official. I would have had absolutely no objection, if the member had not stressed

[Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.]

the fact that there was something *singularly meritorious* in the survey being conducted by a body consisting of a *non-official* majority. That is the view I take of the matter.

Then again, Mr. A. Krishna Pillai wanted to know whether it was not due to the accident of my position here that—

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): Sir, may I ask—

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Sir, I have not finished the sentence. I would be delighted to answer any number of questions after I finish my argument.

I merely wanted to say that it is not due to the accident of my being an official that I took the view that a committee, although with a non-official majority, would not be competent to conduct an economic survey of the country. I have had the luxury of being both an official and a non-official. I am an official in Travancore and a non-official outside Travancore. The object that I had in pressing this point was to show that a committee's work is not like team work. In a committee, any member has a right to veto or traverse the opinion of any other member. But, that is not the case with a team of workers. If I work with a number of scholars, or if a professor works with a number of pupils, the working body of scholars, or the professor and his pupils, cannot be called a committee. They form a team of workers and not a committee. If I may venture to submit, it is this confusion of ideas between a committee and a team work that led to Mr. A. Krishna Pillai's observation that I am taking up the present position on account of the accident of my being an official.

Sir, I have nothing more to say and I am ready to answer any questions of Mr. C. P. Thomas.

MR. C. P. THOMAS (*Nominated*): May I ask Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar whether it is not possible that officials may have a peculiar angle of vision, entirely different from that of the non-officials, and that, in consequence, officials may find it desirable to present the economic condition of the people in a light different from what it actually is?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I am glad I have been asked this question, since it will enable me to say most emphatically that I can never accept this position. It is one of the most mischievous and untrue propositions to say that a man will forget his reason, experience, knowledge, training, feelings and emotions, and lose his conscience so as suddenly to become the slave of, what is called, the official angle of vision. I have never heard of any such angle of vision.

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI (*Kottarakara cum Kidnattur*): Does Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar think that it would be well to have an economic survey conducted before we get into the operation of the next settlement?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): That seems to have been the opinion of the Government. I am not called upon to express an opinion on a matter already settled.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnathnad*): കാൺഷിയൻസിനും മറ്റും കൂട്ടം കൂടാതെതന്നെ അഫീഷ്യൽസിനും നാൺ അഫീഷ്യൽസിനും തമ്മിൽ ഓരോ കാര്യങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടാകുന്നതിൽ അഭിപ്രായവ്യത്യാസം സാധാരണ ഉണ്ടാകുമോ ഇല്ലയോ?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): Differences of opinion are to be found in non-official committees as well as in official committees. If the object is to produce unanimity, non-official committees can show as many examples of discord as perhaps official committees.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): Is Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar aware that in the Scholarships Committee, consisting of a non-official majority, each non-official recorded a different opinion?

RAO BAHADUR K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Principal, College of Arts*): I was not aware of that, Sir, but I can very well believe what Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai says.

PRESIDENT: Do you press your resolution, Mr. Kallur Narayana Pillai?

MR. KALLUR NARAYANA PILLAI (*Pattanamittita*): Yes, Sir.

The resolution was then put to vote and lost, 19 voting for, and 24 against.

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI (*Kottarakara cum Kunnattur*): I demand a poll.

A poll was taken with the following result:

AYES—19.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai. | 11. Mr. R. Padmanabhan. |
| 2. „ Kallur Narayana Pillai. | 12. „ G. Paramesvaran Pillai. |
| 3. „ K. P. Nilakanta Pillai. | 13. „ Changanacherry K. Paramesvaran Pillai. |
| 4. „ M. N. Pillai. | 14. „ N. Kumaran. |
| 5. „ G. Raman Menon. | 15. „ A. K. Pillai. |
| 6. „ Tariatu Kunjitomman. | 16. „ C. P. Kochukunju Pillai. |
| 7. „ K. Madhavan Pillai. | 17. „ K. I. Joseph. |
| 8. „ M. Subrahmanya Pillai. | 18. „ K. K. Thomas. |
| 9. „ M. Sivatanu Pillai. | 19. „ C. Kerala Varma Koil |
| 10. „ K. Sivarama Panikkar. | Tampuran, |

NOES—24.

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. I. C. Chacko | 12. Mr. S. C. H. Robinson |
| 2. „ R. Dhanukoti Pillai | 13. „ J. Stephenson |
| 3. „ K. George | 14. „ A. J. Van Ross. |
| 4. Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai | 15. „ N. Nilakanta Pillai |
| 5. Mr. K. Narayanan Pandalay | 16. „ V. Subba Aiyar |
| 6. „ K. V. Natesa Aiyar | 17. „ K. C. Mammen Mappillai |
| 7. „ Kayalam Paramesvaran Pillai | 18. „ C. P. Thomas |
| 8. „ W. H. Pitt | 19. „ C. P. Tarakan |
| 9. Mrs. M. Poonen Lukose | 20. „ Piraviperumal Pillai |
| 10. Mr. T. P. Ramasubba Aiyar | 21. „ Habeeb Mammad |
| 11. Rao Bahadur K. V. Ranga-swami Aiyangar | 22. „ J. B. Cook |
| | 23. „ S. Gnana Joshua |
| | 24. „ X. G. Lopez. |

NEUTRALS—2.

1. Mr. N. V. Joseph 2. Mr. A. J. John

The resolution was declared lost, 19 voting *for* and 24 *against*.

LEGISLATION.

The Civil Procedure Code Amending Bill.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Aq. Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Sir, I move that the Civil Procedure Code Amending Bill be taken up and move that it be passed at once.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): I second it. The motion was put to vote and carried.

The Limitation Regulation Amending Bill.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Aq. Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Sir, I move that the Limitation Regulation Amending Bill be taken up and move that it be passed at once.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): I second it. The motion was put to vote and carried.

DEMAND FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANT.

DEMAND IX—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Aq. Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Sir, I rise to move for an additional grant not exceeding Rs. 20,000 under Demand IX—Administration of Justice, for bettering the condition of the short-term and under-trial prisoners. I am aware that this is not included in the statement of business for this day. But, as it is an urgent matter and as the Council is to disperse this evening, I hope the Council will excuse the demand being made even to-day.

MR. N. KUMARAN (*Nominated*): May I know what the demand is for?